

-

Murray City Municipal Council Chambers Murray City, Utah

The Municipal Council of Murray City, Utah, met on Tuesday, the 6th day of December 2005 at 6:30 p.m., for a meeting held in the Murray City Council Chambers, 5025 South State Street, Murray, Utah.

Roll Call consisted of the following

Krista Dunn,	Council Chair
Pat Griffiths,	Council Member
Jim Brass,	Council Member
Robbie Robertson,	Council Member
Jeff Dredge,	Council Member - Conducted

Mr. Dredge conducted meeting.

Others who attended:

Doug Hill,	Mayor Pro Tem
Jan Wells,	Chief of Staff
Frank Nakamura,	City Attorney
Shannon Huff Jacobs,	Council Director
Carol Heales,	City Recorder
Dennis Hamblin,	Planning & Zoning
Gary Merrill,	General Manager, Power Department
Boy Scouts,	Troop #92

A. OPENING CEREMONIES

1. Pledge of Allegiance

Dennis Hamblin,

Community Development

2. Approval of Minutes

Minutes of November 15, 2005 & November 22, 2005

Ms. Dunn made a motion to approve both sets of minutes.

Mr. Brass 2nd the motion.

All ayes

3. Special Recognition(s)

B. CITIZEN COMMENTS (Comments are limited to 3 minutes unless otherwise approved by the Council.)

John Metcalf, 6218 South 440 East, Murray, UT

Mr. Metcalf, noted about three or four months ago they did some landscaping to their yard. They have what they call yard art in their front yard. It has been referred to as junk and an abandoned vehicle. He would like to have an interpretation by the City Council to interpret that law. Our intentions are not to start a wrecking yard or collect car parts.

They have had neighborhood support and hopefully to set up a meeting to get all that together and recognize that with some petitions if needed.

Three months ago they were told they could keep that as landscaping, now we are finding out that is not so.

Ms. Dunn has already agreed to set that up that meeting. Mr. Robertson and Ms Dunn will meet with the Metcalf's because they are right on the border between their two districts.

Greta Metcalf, 6218 South 440 East, Murray, UT

Ms. Metcalf is the original homeowner, her husband passed away a couple of years ago and John is her son and has moved in with her and subsequently he is buying the home from her.

Ms. Metcalf is here tonight to tell you her story and appeal to the City Council to dissolve this matter. They purchased a shell of an old 1936 or 1937-coop car with the intention of incorporating it into our landscape. They have a corner lot, they thought it would be very creative addition to their yard. They set it in with some large boulders and rocks and planted some flowers and trees around it. During the weeks that she was working on the planting, they had many cars stop and compliment them on the creativity of their yard art. And many of the walkers expressed their pleasure of what they had done.

People enjoyed watching what they were doing and many said they purposely drove or walked around their corner because they enjoyed seeing it. But it seems they have one neighbor who didn't like it, and he turned them into the Murray City, and also complained about other construction items that they had in their yard. They were adding onto their garage so they did have a small construction site and there was wood and different things around there which they did clean up after the City came out and told them they had to clean up they yard. They cleaned everything that they could and they have tried to go along with everything that they have told them.

Many of their neighbors were upset after they heard what was going on. All her neighbors called the City to voice their support for the Metcalf's. They all felt they should be able to keep their yard art, that one person should not be able to tell another person what they can do in their own yard, as long as it went with the Code.

Ms. Metcalf noted, after some consideration, Ms. Dunn came out and looked at their yard and said it didn't fall into the category of junk metal, scrap metal or it wasn't an abandoned vehicle, because it is just a shell. Ms. Metcalf's hopes are it will, with all the wild flowers coming up the spring, a lot of it will be around it, it will just be like a setting out in the hills.

Ms. Dunn didn't think it fell under any of those categories. Ms. Metcalf has read, gone through the computer and read so many articles that say exactly what they are doing there. Ms. Dunn noted she thought it should be yard art and they could go ahead and keep it and go ahead and continue their landscaping.

After Murray City had been constantly harassed by their neighbor, he seems to be bent on creating problems for them, they are being told they are going to have to remove the car again. They have lived there for about 32 years and they have never had any problems with their neighbors, they are not problem people. It really bothers Ms. Metcalf, in no way do they want to be in violation of City ordinance or code. They would like to have this decided and be able to see in writing just what they are violating if anything. They ask for the Council's consideration and help in resolving this matter.

Glen Bartlett, 6225 South 440 East, Murray, UT

Mr. Barlett has lived at his house for 32 years. If the Metcalf's want that car out there they should have it out there, it is not hurting anybody, it is not bothering anybody. He has lived across the street since they put it in and he has come to like it.

Ginger Johnson, 429 East 6220 South, Murray, UT

Ms. Johnson came to the meeting to express her opinion concerning the Metcalf's landscaping. Ms. Johnson has come up with a number of reason why they should be able to keep it.

1. The current art work in their yard is a major improvement from the previous conditions;
2. Very pleasing to the eye;
3. Adds character to the neighborhood;
4. As a property owner Ms. Johnson feels they should be able to choose their own landscaping however they choose;

5. Property values will increase;
6. Inspiration to future landscapers which the neighborhood could use.

Ms. Dunn said some of the comments are not quite accurate. She wanted to clarify a few items. Originally when this came to Ms. Dunn's attention it was Greta's neighbor, Ginger, who called her to begin with and Ms. Dunn told her she would look into it. Ms. Dunn did take a field trip out there to take a look at it. What Ms. Dunn originally said when she talked to Ginger and others, she has talked to the City Attorney, Police Chief, now everything is okay, because we are going to look at it further. She does not ever think she said, "you are fine, you will never have to move it."

In the meantime, there have been many discussions with the City Attorney, who can attest to over whether or not this fits what our ordinance is or not. Ultimately what Ms. Dunn had hoped to do was to save this for discussions which Council members will be having next month about property maintenance, as they are addressing the ordinance for the city. Ms. Dunn and Mr. Robertson will be happy to schedule a meeting at Ms. Metcalf's and neighbors would she like to have there, the City Attorney, the Code Enforcement Officer, the Police Chief.

C. Consent Agenda

1. Consider confirmation of the Mayor's reappointment of Art Pasker to the Board of Appeals for a term expiring November 1, 2008.
2. Consider confirmation of the Mayor's appointment of Karen Greenwell to the Historic Preservation Advisory Board, representing District 2, for a term expiring August 1, 2008.

Mr. Brass made a motion to adopt the Consent Agenda.

Mr. Robertson 2nd the motion

Call Vote Recorded by Ms. Heales.

AYE/NAY

 A Mr. Robertson
 A Mr. Brass
 A Ms. Griffiths
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed unanimously.

D. PUBLIC HEARING(S)

PUBLIC HEARING

#1069 6:45 p.m.

**Consider an Ordinance vacating a right-of-way
between Lot 22 and 23 of the Olympus
View Subdivision located between 1408 East
5939 South and 1400 East 5935 South,
Murray City, Salt Lake County,
State of Utah.
(Hilton Properties, Marie Matsukawa)**

- a. Staff and sponsor presentations, public comment and discussion prior to Council action on the following matter:

Consider an Ordinance vacating a right-of-way between Lot 22 and 23 of the Olympus View Subdivision located between 1408 East 5939 South and 1400 East 5935 South, Murray City, Salt Lake County, State of Utah. (Hilton Properties, Marie Matsukawa)

Staff Presentation: Doug Hill

Mr. Hill noted, the city has received a request from two property owners, who have a sidewalk easement located on their property line between their homes. The easement starts out at the street, public right-of-way and goes back toward the back part of their lots. The city believes the general intent of this easement was to potentially connect the sidewalk to an elementary school, which is located on the south side of that area.

However when the property behind the homes was developed, the easement was not continued through the area, and so it does not go anyway. It does not make any sense that this easement be left. There is a public purpose for this easement, so what the city is recommending, is to vacate this easement, then it would be up to the property owners to deal with future ownership issues.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Brent Hilton,

Mr. Hilton owns a house that his daughter lives in. What do we do if they do vacate it?

Mr. Hill indicated it is the city's assumption but it is only an assumption that the property would be divided equally down the middle and the ownership would go to each side. That is assuming that it was dedicated

as a public right-of-way by the original subdivision, and the laws would require that that would then go back to adjoining property owners, without the city receiving any compensation for that.

Mr. Hill continued, without doing any survey or title work, the city is only making an assumed assumption that that is the case. If you as property owners would disagree with that, you could do your own title work and own surveys and work it out between yourselves.

Mr. Hilton noted, the neighbor does not want it, and they will probably just buy her interest.

Mr. Hill noted, the city is vacating its interest in that property.

Mr. Nakamura noted it does go to the underlying property owners, we would certainly recommend a title company to look into that.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

- b. Council consideration of the above matter to follow Public Hearing.

Ms. Griffiths made a motion to adopt the ordinance vacating the rights-of-way between Lot 22 and 23 of the Olympus View Subdivision as written.

Ms. Dunn 2nd the motion.

AYE/NAY

A Mr. Robertson
A Mr. Brass
A Ms. Griffiths
A Ms. Dunn
A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed unanimously.

**PUBLIC HEARING
#1068 6:55 p.m.
Consider an Ordinance relating to Zoning;
amends the Zoning Map for property
located at 5323 South Murray
Boulevard, Murray City, Utah from
C-N-C (Conditional Commercial
Neighborhood District) to C-D-C
(Conditional Commercial Development District).
(Millstream Properties)**

- a. Staff and sponsor presentations, public comment and discussion prior to Council action on the following matter:

Consider an Ordinance relating to Zoning; amends the Zoning Map for property located at 5323 South Murray Boulevard, Murray City, Utah from C-N-C (Conditional Commercial Neighborhood District) to C-D-C (Conditional Commercial Development District). (Millstream Properties)

Staff Presentation: Dennis Hamblin

Mr. Hamblin indicated this is a request which was reviewed by the Planning Commission on October 6, 2005. The Developer is looking at purchasing a property that is located at Murray Boulevard, contains about 2.78 acres of ground. They are petitioning to change the zoning from the C-N-C zone which covers this area, to put that 2.78 acres into a C-D-C or commercial development zone.

The purpose that the developer is wanting to do this is so that they can buy and build a short term care facility on the property. Right now that use is allowed in the C-D zone but it is not allowed in C-N-C zone, and that is the purpose for their petition. The Planning Commission reviewed this and it comes with a negative recommendation on a 3 to 1 vote by the members that were present that evening.

The developer has also petitioned, which will be forthcoming on the 20th of December to amend the C-N-C zone to put this use in as an alternative, should this action not be approved in their favor this evening.

Mr. Brass asked Mr. Hamblin if that petition to add this use has gone through Planning & Zoning or is it on the agenda?

Mr. Hamblin answered, it has already gone through Planning & Zoning.

Mr. Bruce Heywood, 760 North Millroad, Heber, UT

Mr. Heywood is the applicant on this project. When they first started the process with the City, they sat down with the Planning Department and looked at the General Plan. It was identified as a mixed use development area. When they talked to the Planning Department about the possibility of changing from a C-N-C to a C-D zone, they said that that would be consistent with the General Plan as it has been as it has been adopted at this point in time.

Mr. Heywood continued, they felt their application for the change from a C-N-C to a C-D zone was consistent with the General Plan and so from that perspective they felt like they would qualify for this change. Secondly, they looked at the uses for the both C-D-C and the C-N-C zone. Their particular use is not listed, either as a permitted use or as a conditional use, currently in the C-M-C zone. The C-D-C does however show their use as a conditional use.

Whether it is a C-D-C zone or C-N-C zone in either case, they will not be bypassing a public hearing on their project, or on what they intend to use the property for. There really won't be any difference from the standpoint of having a public hearing, having public comment, having public input into the project. They feel that with the proximity that it has to other C-D-C properties. They do not see why there would be an issue with changing it to a C-D-C zone.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Blake Jessop, 5482, Avalon Drive, Murray, UT

Mr. Jessop noted as a representative of the current property owner, he supports it would this petition. It is his opinion there would not be a great change to move in this and the use is very consistent with the ideas for the city, the General Plan and for the area. He would ask the Council to approve this petition.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

b. Council consideration of the above matter to follow Public Hearing.

Ms. Dunn asked if a petition to change the current zone to allow the use that is being put forward has already been seen by the Planning & Zoning Commission. Has it already been scheduled to come before the Council in Public Hearing and do we have a date set?

Mr. Hamblin noted it is set for December 20, 2005.

Mr. Brass has a copy of the General Plan. It is a combination of commercial/retail and mixed use. It is open to interpretation. In reading the minutes, Mr. Brass understands the concern about going with a C-D-C versus C-N-C. Mr. Brass thought it would be better to wait until the 20th and look at it again.

Ms. Dunn said it was interesting looking at the map of the General Plan, it meanders in and out, and it appears that the property has different zone plans on that plat.

Mr. Hamblin noted, a couple of scenarios for future use, both mixed zone.

Ms. Dunn noted she does not see a whole lot of change from one to the other. The most prudent thing to do is to wait until the 20th and make it an allowable use there.

Mr. Heywood said, one thing that he wants to emphasize is the Planning & Zoning had no problem with the use that they are proposing for a piece of property. His only feeling would be if they get to the 20th and the Council decides they don't want to change the ordinance, would they then have to come back again to potentially change the zone as a result? They want to get this hurried along, they feel like to a certain degree Planning and Zoning was splitting hairs on the difference between C-N-C and C-D-C zones. When they look at the differences, the major distinguishing characteristics which he has seen were that the C-D-C zone allows a lot more conditional uses than the C-N-C zone does, which requires a public hearing, which allows the public to comment and allows approval to be required, through Planning & Zoning.

Ms. Griffiths is inclined to uphold the decision to the Planning & Zoning Commission and wait until the 20th.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

Ms. Griffiths made a motion that we uphold the decision of the Planning & Zoning Commission and deny the request.

Dies for lack of 2nd.

Ms. Dunn said this is a tough one because the entire Council agrees. The Planning & Zoning did exactly what they were supposed to do on this. They checked with the General Plan. Ms. Dunn does not like to have these people wait any longer.

Ms. Brass noted, they do not look at the use, but what could happen. With considering the zone and they don't build it, what else comes? The city has had that problem in other areas. It is not the use, it is what could happen.

Mr. Hill suggested continuing this discussion until the December 20th meeting, which would mean that it would not have to be re-agended should Mr. Heywood decide to not include a use in a C-N-C zone, that way it could all be handled on the 20th.

Mr. Nakamura noted if it was denied and a decision is made on the 20th, Mr. Heywood would have to reapply again.

Ms. Griffiths withdrew her previous motion and the Council will continue discussion.

Ms. Dunn 2nd the motion.

Ms. Dunn noted two weeks would not be a whole lot of difference to the applicant in terms of us putting them out for a decision, but it is a better option.

Mr. Nakamura did not want to presume a decision on the 20th because there are two different issues, General Land Use and a Specific Use. You will receive different input.

Call Vote Recorded by Ms. Heales.

AYE/NAY

 A Mr. Robertson
 A Mr. Brass
 A Ms. Griffiths
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING

#1066 7:00 p.m.

**Consider an Ordinance relating to
Land Use; amends the General Plan
from Single-Family Low Density
Residential to Multi-Family Low
Density Residential and amends the
Zoning Map from R-1-8 to R-M-10 for
the property located at approximately
5670 South 1300 East,
Murray, Utah. (Prince Development)**

- a. Staff and sponsor presentations, public comment and discussion prior to Council action on the following matter:

Consider an Ordinance relating to Land Use; amends the General Plan from Single-Family Low Density Residential to Multi-Family Low Density Residential and amends the Zoning Map from R-1-8 to R-M-10 for the property located at approximately 5670 South 1300 East, Murray, Utah. (Prince Development)

Staff Presentor: Dennis Hamblin

Mr. Hamblin noted, this item was reviewed by the Planning Commission on September 1, 2005. The property in question is across from Cottonwood High School does have R-M zoning to the north and to the west, the rest is in an R-1-8 zone. The Planning Commission reviewed this item and it comes with negative recommendation to the City Council on a 5 to 1 vote.

Applicant: Alan Prince

Mr. Prince, 30 Wanderwood Way, Sandy, UT

Mr. Prince noted the initial interest was to build a four-plex, and then as they started to look through with staff on some of the options under multi-family housing they found an area where there were bonus units permitted, to locate elderly residents in an Elderly Housing Unit. It was with that idea they decided to pursue this. Mr. Prince has withdrawn those plans.

In the meeting the Planning Commission in September, they are adjacent neighbors to the north of them who has multi-family housing, said one side which is suppose to be ½ an acre, is too small for six units. His neighbors would like to see a four-plex and wouldn't have a problem with that.

Mr. Prince found out they no longer have the land available to them to build a six-plex, so he is taking that off the table. He is withdrawing the intended use of a six-plex. If they can gain approval for the R-10 zoning which the issue was this evening, they would like to pursue the construction of a four-plex on that property.

Mr. Prince noted this property is not harming the neighborhood in any way, to become an R-M10 property. In fact, R-M-10 represents the highest and best use of that parcel of property.

Mr. Prince thought, if their application for R-M-10 is compelled to build some family homes, they have the room to build two family homes.. They can subdivide the lot, it is 150' wide. The lot in a R-1-8 zone which requires 80' wide, with a 30' back of the setback. To build two homes, they would have needed 160' not 150'. The staff indicated to him they are so close they will work with them and work with Murray City to get a variance where they could have two lots 75' wide instead of 80' and could fit two homes there.

Despite the records of the County, despite any information on their Warranty Deed and Title Insurance they received, every evidence they had 53 hundredth of an acre zone R-1-8 - 150' of frontage. In actual fact, they began to lay out a subdivision plat for two homes, so they would subdivide this piece of property and put two residences there. They discovered that the beginning on 5600 South, if you take the measurement at each of those

properties, then come down to the north of them, adjacent to the parcel, there has been an error in the County records and part of the parcel has been shorted. It cuts the dimensions down to 126' instead of 150'. The option now of building two lots, he will not get a variance for that small lot. They are stuck with a very serious law suit to go back and redeem that property.

Mr. Prince continued, RM permits them to have a very small property, being they could go back and recapture the value of the 26' strip and use the balance of the property. They did not know this information until they started to prepare the survey pursuant to the subdivision plat which they would have brought to the City.

They are here with a plea to please help them remedy this situation. All of these properties are confirmed to size which shows on the plat except for the last one and no longer it is there 53 hundredths of an acre.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Virginia Talbot, 5926 Loop Pine Way, Salt Lake City, UT

Ms. Talbot's problem and concern are the Master Plan. The Master Plan was set up that included this neighborhood as single family dwellings. There is no guarantee that what the developers is presenting for him to do will be done. When the zoning is changed, anything can happen, and the neighbors are concerned about that. They purchased their homes knowing that was a single residence area and they would like to see it maintained.

One property at a time the developers are coming in and buying the larger lots wanting to put multiple family dwellings on them and one property at a time their neighborhood is changing its complexion in changing from single family to multiple family dwelling. As the neighborhood she respectfully requests that you deny the amendment and support the Master Plan as it was developed.

Michael Card, 1241 East 5840 South, Salt Lake City, UT

Mr. Card is very opposed to this amendment to change from R-1-8 to an R-M-10. His worry is also the same what is to stop the contractors from moving down the whole section and turning it into an R-M-10 and then once it is into an R-M-10, what are they going to put there. They have changed their plans many times, it goes from one thing to another and it is very perplexed. When Mr. Card bought his house it was an R-1-8 and it was an extremely nice neighborhood.

Another problem Mr. Card has is there are a lot of children along 13th East that walk to school, and increasing the amount of traffic going off those driveways and along 13th East, that is a major area for traffic accidents.

They have widened the street which is a great thing. Adding a lot more subdivisions would be more trouble.

Kristine Nelson, 1231 East 5840 South, Salt Lake City, UT

Ms. Nelson has lived at her address for fifteen years, prior to this she grew up in the area. She is well aware of the neighborhood and keeping it into a single family area. A lot of us are younger people, our parents still live here. We are moving back because of the integrity of the neighborhood, and we want to keep it as such.

She has heard a lot of different things as far as what may or may not be going in. They do have heavy traffic on 13th East, but she would like to see it maintained as an R-1-8. She is assuming that due to the weather this evening, she has several people would have attended. If you want a petition, let her know what she needs to do.

Nelson Agum, Turner Drive, Salt Lake City, UT

Mr. Agum's concern is what's to stop the developer from changing their plans. They moved in this neighborhood ten years ago for the neighborhood. They enjoy it and a lot of kids cross over it to go to the high school, and they do not need any more traffic with two houses, ten houses, whatever they plan on doing. He would like to keep the integrity of the neighborhood intact as well.

Mr. Prince noted if he lived by the property where he plans to build, he would be concerned about an R-1-10 right next to me. He is concerned that he has just the reverse of that with R-1-10 next to him, behind him, all over him, with those uses being readily being used and even a neighbor to the south of him that isn't shaded in the R-M-10 uses his R-M-10. So for Mr. Prince to put an expensive single family home in this location doesn't make any sense at all. Out on 13th East as these people have pointed out where there is a busy arterial, building a new home does not make great sense.

In terms of a Master Plan, this property came into Murray City just a few years ago, he does not know of a Master Plan that would call for that exact piece. All he is asking for is the highest and the best use of a piece of property which now as we see the neighborhood overlaps will not fit a single family residence in the manner we once envisioned it would. They haven't changed their plans, he will make a commitment right now that they like to build a 4-plex, that is all he wishes to do. They reason they changed from a 6-plex was the 6-plex was based on the acreage of .53. If .53 is not available, he is not going to come and bore you with a plan to come and do something that won't fit.

Mr. Brass noted again, the question is not what is going on the property, is the zone appropriate. Because once you change that zone, whatever is permitted in that zone could be built on that property. They have no idea what is going to happen.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

- b. Council consideration of the above matter to follow Public Hearing.

Ms. Griffiths position is to uphold the Planning Commission's recommendations, therefore she moved to deny the application.

Ms. Dunn 2nd the motion.

Call Vote Recorded by Ms. Heales.

AYE/NAY

 A Mr. Robertson
 A Mr. Brass
 A Ms. Griffiths
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed unanimously

PUBLIC HEARING

#1067 7:10 p.m.

**Consider an Ordinance related to Zoning;
amends the Zoning Map for property
located at 6113 South 900 East,
Murray City, Utah from A-1
(Agricultural District) to R-1-8
(Residential Single Family Low
Density District). (Carl Church)**

- a. Staff and sponsor presentations, public comment and discussion prior to Council action on the following matter:

Consider an Ordinance related to Zoning; amends the Zoning Map for property located at 6113 South 900 East, Murray City, Utah from A-1 (Agricultural District) to R-1-8 (Residential Single Family Low Density District). (Carl Church)

Staff Presentation: Dennis Hamblin

Mr. Hamblin noted, this item was reviewed on October 6, 2005. The property in question is located at 6113 South 9th East. Other properties in this area, also petitioned by Mr. Church, were approved favorably by the Council. There is an opportunity to include this parcel now and the applicant is requesting a zone change from A-1 to R-1-8.

The developer proposed to do some single family development. Some of this property is owned by the city and they are in negotiations with the City in resolving it. It does come with a favorable recommendation with a 4-0 vote by the Planning Commission to change the zone from A-1 to R-1-8.

Mr. Church made no comments

PUBLIC COMMENTS

_____ None

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

- b. Council consideration of the above matter to follow Public Hearing.

Mr. Brass made a motion to approve the ordinance Zoning Map for property located at 6113 South 900 East, Murray City, Utah from A-1 (Agricultural District) to R-1-8 (Residential Single Family Low Density District).

Ms. Dunn 2nd the motion.

Call Vote Recorded by Ms. Heales

AYE/NAY

 A Mr. Robertson
 A Mr. Brass
 A Ms. Griffiths
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed unanimously

E UNFINISHED BUSINESS

None scheduled.

F. NEW BUSINESS

1. Consider a Resolution adopting the 2006 Annual Meeting Schedule for the Murray City Municipal Council.

Mr. Robertson made a motion to adopt the 2006 Annual Meeting Schedule for the Murray City Municipal Council.

Ms. Griffiths 2nd the motion.

Call Vote Recorded by Ms. Heales

AYE/NAY

<u>A</u>	Mr. Robertson
<u>A</u>	Mr. Brass
<u>A</u>	Ms. Griffiths
<u>A</u>	Ms. Dunn
<u>A</u>	Mr. Dredge

Motion passed unanimously

2. Consider a Resolution authorizing the execution of a Mutual Aid Agreement between Murray City Corporation and various other participating members of the American Public Power Association providing for the discretionary rendering of compensated aid amongst the participants.

Staff Presentator: Gary Merrill

Mr. Merrill noted a Mutual Aid Agreement in form provides means by which they can establish reimbursement for the Aid providing agency and sets up a network of relationships to share equipment, lists, inventory and skill sets that can go along way toward responding to an emergency. This particular resolution relates to the American Public Power Association, building a relationship on a broader level. Mr. Merrill does not anticipate Murray City Power being involved in a national disaster response, but certainly APPA would enable us to coordinate more regionally beyond a state level. We have all learned that preparedness is the key to success in response. We have taken the initiative to propose this resolution and ask for your support.

Ms. Griffiths made a motion authorizing the execution of a Mutual Aid Agreement between Murray City Corporation and various other participating members of the American Public Power Association providing for the discretionary rendering of compensated aid amongst the participants.

Mr. Robertson 2nd the motion.

Call Vote Recorded by Ms. Heales

AYE/NAY

 A Mr. Robertson
 A Mr. Brass
 A Ms. Griffiths
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed unanimously

3. Consider a Resolution authorizing the execution of a Mutual Aid Agreement between Murray City Corporation and various other participating members of the Utah Associated Municipal Power Systems providing for the discretionary rendering of compensated aid amongst the participants.

Staff Presentator: Gary Merrill

Mr. Merrill noted this is the same resolution for local & statewide power agencies to be prepared and proactive those unforeseen circumstances that, either we can be rendering aid to a fellow city, municipal utility or they can come to our aid.

Mr. Merrill considered the agreement to be more of an administrative process.

Mr. Robertson made a motion to adopt the resolution.

Mr. Brass 2nd the motion.

Call Vote Recorded by Ms. Heales

AYE/NAY

 A Mr. Robertson
 A Mr. Brass
 A Ms. Griffiths
 A Ms. Dunn
 A Mr. Dredge

Motion passed unanimously

G. MAYOR

1. Report

2. Questions of the Mayor

- ✓ Ms. Griffiths noted everyone noticed the beautiful Christmas lights on the library. They were provided by the Friends of the Library.

Last Friday there was a very nice social for the library staff and the library board.

- ✓ Mr. Merrill noted there was an article in the Tribune on Sunday that highlighted the emergency issues of the potential flu epidemic and how electrical services need to plan for that type of disaster. The thing that really caught Mr. Merrill's attention was the need for corporations that have large groups of employees such as Murray City, to consider an ***Emergency Waiver of Sick Leave Limitations*** in order to encourage employees not to come into work sick.

Mr. Merrill suggested the idea for purpose of discussion only. The article related it similar to snow days.

One more thing that caught Mr. Merrill's attention was inventory. The article gave a scenario of a blizzard lasting 18 months. What would you do if your suppliers were negatively impacted in their ability to bring their supply to you for you to provide your service to your citizens. This mutual aid is just a kickoff of those thoughts. Mr. Merrill is not speaking for Administration, he was simply suggesting some consideration of those possibilities.

H. ADJOURNMENT

Recorded by Carol Heales, City Recorder